



Cornell University
ILR School

Cornell University ILR School
DigitalCommons@ILR

Faculty Publications - Human Resource Studies

Human Resource Studies

April 1975

Mexican Immigrants and the Labor Market

Vernon M. Briggs Jr.

Cornell University, vmb2@cornell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/hrpubs>

Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR.

Support this valuable resource today!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Human Resource Studies at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - Human Resource Studies by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact catherwood-dig@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

Mexican Immigrants and the Labor Market

Abstract

"An analysis of the effect of illegal Mexican immigrants on the United States labor market of 1975."

Keywords

Mexican, labor, market, U.S. , immigration, immigrant, policies, worker, United States, illegal, border, law

Comments

Suggested Citation

Briggs, V. M., Jr. (1975). Mexican immigrants and the labor market. *Texas Business Review*, 49(4), 85-90.
<http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/hr/33/>

Required Publisher Statement

Reprinted with permission from [Texas Business Review](#), Bureau of Business Research, IC2 Institute, The University of Texas at Austin.

Mexican Immigrants and the Labor Market

Vernon M. Briggs, Jr.*

Although the significance of illegal migration for the U.S. labor market has been mounting rapidly since the end of World War II, it is receiving special attention during the current period of high unemployment in Texas and throughout the United States. Immigration and border policies in general and the enforcement of existing statutes in particular have been scrutinized and found inadequate.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service of the U.S. Department of Justice estimates that between seven and twelve million illegal immigrants currently reside in the United States.¹ An estimated 500,000 of these illegal entrants are living in Texas.² The Service also estimates that only one of every five illegal aliens is apprehended. Most of those caught are from Mexico (e.g., 88 percent of all apprehended in 1973 were from Mexico); many come from the Caribbean, Greece, Hong Kong, Italy, and other areas.

Since unemployment is increasing in Mexico as well as in the United States and since American-owned businesses in Mexico are cutting back employment of Mexican laborers sharply because of recession, it is likely that the problem will become even more acute in the near future. Unemployment is particularly high in the Texas border labor market areas of Laredo, Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg, and El Paso.

National Policy

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 expressly states that it is national policy to reserve available jobs for the domestic labor force. Referring to this act, the California Court of Appeals ruled in 1970 that the number of illegal aliens in the Southwest "represents an abject

failure of national policy." Moreover, the court observed that the lack of meaningful corrective action "must be ascribed to self-imposed impotence of our national government."³ Unfortunately, the U.S. government has failed to grasp the full proportions of this issue. Illegal entry from Mexico is still widely considered to be only "a regional problem" of the Southwest. Hence the topic has not been very high on the list of national priorities.

Because the problem is becoming increasingly acute, however, there are indications that the 94th Congress, which convened in January 1975, may act on the matter. Legislative relief can be achieved only at the federal level, since immigration policy is considered to be solely the province of the federal government. Two states—California and Connecticut—have passed laws making it unlawful for an employer to hire illegal aliens, only to have the laws declared unconstitutional. Legislation that would make it a felony for an employer to hire an illegal alien is now being considered by Congress.

Mexican Migration

The migration of citizens of Mexico into the United States—both legally and illegally—has been a fact of life as long as a political border has separated the two nations. During the latter half of the nineteenth century the migration was only a trickle. But the magnitude has increased significantly throughout most of the twentieth century until, by the 1970s, it has reached tidal wave proportions. One knowledgeable U.S. senator, who led an extensive congressional inquiry in 1970 into the economic conditions along the southwest border, succinctly characterized the migration as "a massive hemorrhage."⁴

Legal Migration

Legal Mexican immigrants have exerted significant influence upon the labor markets of the major cities of the Southwest, particularly in Texas and California. Except for certain border communities, however, the impact of the legal immigrants from Mexico is not yet an overwhelming problem. Legal migration is far exceeded, not only in

*Dr. Briggs is a professor of economics at The University of Texas at Austin. This article is based on a paper presented in West Berlin at the First International Conference on Migrant Workers, sponsored by the International Institute of Management, in December 1974. An expanded version of the paper, *Mexican Migration and the U.S. Labor Market: A Mounting Issue for the Seventies*, appeared in March 1975 as no. 3 in the *Studies in Human Resource Development* series, published jointly by the Bureau of Business Research and the Center for the Study of Human Resources at The University of Texas at Austin.

LEGAL IMMIGRATION FROM MEXICO
TO THE UNITED STATES,
1869-1973

Year	Immigrants	Year	Immigrants	Year	Immigrants
1869	320	1904	1,009	1939	2,265
1870	463	1905	2,637	1940	1,914
1871	402	1906	1,997	1941	2,068
1872	569	1907	1,406	1942	2,182
1873	606	1908	6,067	1943	3,985
1874	386	1909	16,251	1944	6,399
1875	610	1910	17,760	1945	6,455
1876	631	1911	18,784	1946	6,805
1877	445	1912	22,001	1947	7,775
1878	465	1913	10,954	1948	8,730
1879	556	1914	13,089	1949	7,977
1880	492	1915	10,993	1950	6,841
1881	325	1916	17,198	1951	6,372
1882	366	1917	16,438	1952	9,600
1883	469	1918	17,602	1953	18,454
1884	430	1919	28,844	1954	37,456
1885	323	1920	51,042	1955	50,772
1886	n.a.	1921	29,603	1956	65,047
1887	n.a.	1922	18,246	1957	49,154
1888	n.a.	1923	62,709	1958	26,712
1889	n.a.	1924	87,648	1959	23,061
1890	n.a.	1925	32,378	1960	32,684
1891	n.a.	1926	42,638	1961	41,632
1892	n.a.	1927	66,766	1962	55,291
1893	n.a.	1928	57,765	1963	55,253
1894	109	1929	38,980	1964	32,967
1895	116	1930	11,915	1965	37,969
1896	150	1931	2,627	1966	45,163
1897	91	1932	1,674	1967	42,371
1898	107	1933	1,514	1968	43,563
1899	163	1934	1,470	1969	44,623
1900	237	1935	1,232	1970	44,469
1901	347	1936	1,308	1971	50,103
1902	709	1937	1,918	1972	64,040
1903	528	1938	2,014	1973	70,141

Total, 1869-1973 1,737,185

n.a. Data not available.

Sources: For years 1869-1969, the data is taken from Table 1-A of a mimeographed paper, "Mexican Immigration," presented by Julian Samora at the Conference on Economic and Educational Perspectives of the Mexican American (Aspen, Colorado, August 27, 1972); the figures for 1970-1973 are from annual reports of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

number but also in severity of consequences, by illegal entry. Most illegal Mexican aliens enter the U.S. economy as workers, whereas almost half of the legal Mexican immigrants are dependents.

There are several important differences between legal Mexican immigrants and other legal immigrants. The foremost difference is that Mexicans overwhelmingly prefer to reside in one of the five southwestern states. Legal Mexican immigrants are also more likely to have friends and relatives who are already citizens of the United States than are other immigrant groups. But perhaps most important is that legal Mexican immigrants tend to have a significantly different occupational distribution from that of legal entrants from other nations. Although most occupations are represented in the distribution for Mexican immigrants, a disproportionately high number of Mexicans are blue collar workers. Legal Mexican immigrants tend to be craftsmen, household service workers, nonfarm laborers,

and farm laborers.⁵ The explanation for this occupational difference from other immigrant groups is probably that a significant number of legal immigrants were once illegal aliens.

Illegal Migration

From 1939 to 1973 approximately nine million persons immigrated to the United States from all the countries of the world. During the same period more than seven million illegal Mexican aliens were apprehended and deported to Mexico. To be sure, some persons were arrested more than once during this period; but since those who are actually apprehended constitute only a small fraction of the real flow of illegal migration, the thrust of the argument is not dulled when allowances are made for double counting.

On March 26 R. W. Heston, Houston district director for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, announced that 560 illegal aliens had been deported from the six-county Houston district and 358 from the Galveston district since March 12.⁶ Louis A. Mack of the Austin-San Antonio district estimated in March that at least 50,000 illegal aliens are now in the city of San Antonio. Every month approximately 1,000 aliens are transported back to Mexico from Mack's twenty-two-county district, he says.⁷

Impact of Illegal Migration

Most illegal aliens in the Texas labor market are concentrated in service and construction occupations.⁸

ILLEGAL MEXICAN ALIENS APPREHENDED AND/OR DEPORTED, 1924-1973

Year	Number of aliens	Year	Number of aliens	Year	Number of aliens
1924	4,614	1941	6,082	1958	45,164
1925	2,961	1942	10,603	1959	42,732
1926	4,047	1943	16,154	1960	39,750
1927	4,495	1944	39,449	1961	39,860
1928	5,529	1945	80,760	1962	41,200
1929	8,538	1946	116,320	1963	51,230
1930	18,319	1947	214,543	1964	41,589
1931	8,409	1948	193,852	1965	48,948
1932	7,116	1949	289,400	1966	89,683
1933	15,875	1950	469,581	1967	107,695
1934	8,910	1951	510,355	1968	142,520
1935	9,139	1952	531,719	1969	189,572
1936	9,534	1953	839,149	1970	265,539
1937	9,535	1954	1,035,282	1971	348,178
1938	8,684	1955	165,186	1972	430,213
1939	9,376	1956	58,792	1973	576,823
1940	8,051	1957	45,640		

Total, 1924-1973 7,266,695

Note: There is a considerable problem with the exact figures used to report illegal aliens. The official definitions have changed over time. Nevertheless, these figures do reflect correctly the orders of magnitude.

Source: For the years 1924-1941, see Samora, "Mexican Immigration," Table III; for 1942-1973, see Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., *The Mexico-United States Border: Public Policy and Chicano Economic Welfare* (Austin, Texas: Center for the Study of Human Resources and Bureau of Business Research, 1974), p. 9.

Historically, however, the impact of the illegal Mexican immigrant has been felt in the rural economy of the Southwest. Having typically come from a rural background with little knowledge of either urban work skills or the English language, the illegal alien found employment more easily in rural areas.

The rural Southwest is a vast land area with small population clusters. The climate is dry and water is scarce. The population pattern has been correctly referred to as "an oasis society."⁹ Hence crop farmers and ranchers have usually not been able to draw upon a labor supply in their local areas. Their needs are especially acute during planting and harvesting seasons, when they have been more than willing to employ cheap and dependent illegal aliens to meet their manpower needs.

There are numerous accounts of illegal aliens being paid wages below prescribed minimum wage levels and of employers turning in their alien workers to immigration authorities at the end of the season, before they collect their pay. In this way the aliens, who themselves deprive native workers of jobs at minimum pay levels, are often victimized by employers who know that the aliens have no recourse to justice. As one government official who has decried the widespread abuses and exploitation of the aliens has stated, "Nobody gives a damn since aliens are nobody's constituents."¹⁰

Another serious impact of the illegal Mexican aliens upon the rural economy of the Southwest since the 1940s is their contribution to the pressure for Chicanos to move from rural to urban areas.¹¹ In the 1950 and 1960 censuses the Chicano population was the least urbanized of the three major groups who populate the Southwest: Chicanos, blacks, and whites who do not have Spanish surnames. The 1970 census, however, showed Chicanos to be the most urbanized of these groups. Often Chicanos who have been displaced from the rural economy have been totally unprepared for their new life in an urban labor market. In this way the illegal Mexican immigrants have contributed to the situation that has resulted in serious economic hardship and geographic dislocation for the Chicano labor force of the rural Southwest.

The illegal Mexican aliens have continually forestalled efforts of workers in low wage industries of the Southwest to become unionized. Often their presence so depresses wages and working conditions that native workers who might otherwise seek to establish a trade union are forced to look elsewhere for employment. When the native workers remain in the industry and attempt to form a union, the illegal Mexican aliens are frequently used as strikebreakers.

The illegal Mexican aliens have also had another adverse effect upon Chicanos. It is no accident that about half of the remaining seasonally migrant agricultural workers in the United States are Chicanos who come from the South Texas region that borders on Mexico. Many Chicanos of this region are forced to become migrant laborers because the local labor market is overrun by illegal Mexican aliens and border commuters (people who live in Mexico because of its lower cost of living but, because of ambiguities in the

APRIL 1975

NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE POPULATION GROWTH
IN BORDER CITIES,
1960-1970

City	1960	1970	Percent increase
Brownsville, Texas	48,040	52,522	9
Matamoros, Tamaulipas	143,043	182,887	28
McAllen, Texas	32,728	37,636	15
Reynosa, Tamaulipas	134,869	143,514	6
Laredo, Texas	60,678	69,024	14
Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas	96,043	150,922	57
Eagle Pass, Texas	12,094	15,364	27
Piedras Negras, Coahuila	48,408	65,883	36
El Paso, Texas	276,687	322,261	16
Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua	276,995	436,054	57
Nogales, Arizona	7,286	8,946	23
Nogales, Sonora	39,812	52,865	33
Calexico, California	7,992	10,625	33
Mexicali, Baja California	281,333	390,411	39
San Diego, California	573,224	696,769	22
Tijuana, Baja California	165,690	335,125	102
United States total	1,018,729	1,213,147	19
Mexico total	1,186,193	1,757,661	48

Source: *Annual Report-1971*, Texas Good Neighbor Commission.

immigration statutes, are able to work legally in the United States).¹² Although public policy in the United States has tried repeatedly to improve the economic plight of these native migrant workers by preparing them for nonmigrant vocations, all of these attempts have failed. The reason is that the programs have never been able to handle the basic problem that causes internal seasonal migrancy: too few job opportunities that offer wages at a level permitting a decent standard of life are available in the workers' home base communities. The influx of illegal Mexican immigrants and of border commuters has set in motion a process whereby poor Mexicans make poor Chicanos poorer.¹³

The Chicano citizens of the Southwest have borne disproportionately the weight of this burden. However, other groups and other geographic areas are increasingly feeling this pressure. Indirectly, of course, the United States itself suffers from the presence of an increasing number of illegal Mexican aliens. Some short-run private sector gains may be realized by the exploitation of the alien workers. But in the long run the presence of a growing number of workers who are denied political rights as well as minimum legal and job protections is a sure prescription for trouble. Living at a survival level and under the constant fear of being detected, working in the most competitive and least unionized sectors of the economy, and often being victimized by criminal elements, these workers may find themselves part of a situation that will not only be uncontrolled but will soon be uncontrollable.

Over the nearly two centuries of its existence the United States has developed numerous laws, programs, and institutions that have sought to reduce the magnitude of human cruelty and the incidence of economic uncertainty for most of its citizens. For the illegal alien workers, however, these benefits are virtually nonexistent. It would be self-decep-

The Bracero Program

1942-1964

In the 1940s, with the advent of the Second World War, the military requirements of the United States and its related manufacturing needs led to a labor shortage in the agricultural sector. The farmers of the Southwest had foreseen these developments before the Pearl Harbor attack in 1941. They had made two fateful decisions: first, the pool of cheap labor in Mexico was to be tapped to fill the manpower deficit; second, the federal government was to be the vehicle of deliverance.*

The initial requests of U.S. farmers for the establishment of a contract labor program were denied by the federal government in 1941. By mid-1942, however, the U.S. government had come to favor the program but the government of Mexico balked at the prospect of a formal intergovernment agreement. The unregulated hiring of Mexican citizens by foreign nations had been prohibited by Article 123 of the Mexican Constitution of 1917. Moreover, in the 1940s the Mexican economy was flourishing; Mexican workers justifiably feared that they would be drafted; there were bitter memories of the "repatriation drive" of the 1930s; and there was knowledge of the discriminatory treatment accorded people of Mexican ancestry throughout the Southwest.

Negotiations between the two governments, however, resulted in a formal agreement, achieved in August 1942. The Mexican Labor Program, better known as the "bracero program," was launched. Mexican workers were to be afforded numerous protections with respect to housing, transportation, food, medical needs, and wage rates. Initiated through appropriations for P.L. 45, the program was extended by subsequent enactment until 1947. Braceros were limited exclusively to agricultural work. Any bracero who was found holding a job in any other industry was subject to immediate deportation. When the agreement ended December 31, 1947, the program was continued informally and was unregulated until 1951. In that year, under the guise of another war-related labor shortage, the bracero program was once again formalized by P.L. 78. This program continued to function until it was unilaterally terminated by the United States on December 31, 1964. Since then the government of Mexico has made numerous proposals for the resumption of the program but, to date, the United States has not acceded. Several bills to revive the program have been introduced in the U.S. Congress by representatives of southwestern agricultural districts but they have yet to clear a congressional committee.

*Ernesto Galarza, *Merchants of Labor: The Mexican Bracero Story* (Charlotte, North Carolina: McNally and Loftin, 1964).

tion to believe that illegal migration can continue to grow without eventual dire consequences.

Policies Needed

With respect to migration of Mexicans into the United States, a number of policy measures are urgently needed.

Assimilating Legal Immigrants

The impact of legal immigration is unevenly felt. Specific cities and states have been hard hit. To assist in the absorption of these new citizens, the federal government could provide "special impact" funds to school districts and community organizations that assist these immigrants in settlement. Ample precedent for providing such funds already exists in the form of programs organized to help communities in which large military bases or defense organizations are located. In addition, special programs could be initiated in these high impact areas to help immigrants learn of existing legal protections; to make available information about training facilities and job placement centers; and to offer special classes in English with stipends for attendance.

Labor certification procedures for new immigrants need reform. Since the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the Secretary of Labor has had the authority to block entry of immigrants if their presence endangers prevailing American labor standards. The Immigration Act of 1965 added to this authority. It requires that immigrant job seekers also receive a job certification which states that a shortage of workers exists in the applicant's particular occupation and that his presence will not adversely affect prevailing wages and working conditions. Aside from the fact that the entire procedure is fraught with loopholes, the problem is that the certification is made only *once*—when the initial application for immigration is made. It has been suggested that a negative certification be adopted to ensure that the legal immigrant workers do not seek employment in overcrowded occupations or economically depressed areas, or serve as strikebreakers, or become employees of certain employers with histories of illegal activities.¹⁴ The system would include a probationary period, perhaps one year, during which compliance by workers and employers could be assessed. A 1971 study found that only one of every thirteen immigrants to the United States was subject to the certification system.¹⁵ This slippage is too great.

Regulating Employment of Illegal Aliens

It is against the law for an illegal alien to seek employment, but it is *not* against the law for an employer to hire an illegal alien. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 made the importation and harboring of illegal aliens a felony. As a concession to Texas agricultural interests, however, the act contains the famous "Texas proviso." This section states that employment and the related services provided by employers to employees (i.e., transportation, housing, or feeding) do not constitute an

illegal act of harboring. The effect of the "proviso" is to make employers largely immune from prosecution if they hire such workers. Even employers whose premises are raided regularly by the Immigration and Naturalization Service are rarely prosecuted. Thus one of the most important barriers to effective control of illegal entrants is the fact that employment of an illegal alien is not itself illegal. Since an employer incurs no risk, he is free to hire illegal aliens; this encourages the flow across the border.

Rodino Bill

Because of the burgeoning dimensions of the issue, extensive public hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. House of Representatives during 1971 and 1972. A bill that would require employers to make a "good faith" effort to determine whether their employees are legal citizens of this country was passed by the House in 1972 (during the 92nd Congress) and in 1973 (during the 93rd Congress) by overwhelming vote margins. The proposal, known popularly as the "Rodino bill" after the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Representative Peter W. Rodino (D-New Jersey), imposed sanctions against employers who "knowingly" hire illegal aliens. The penalties ranged from warnings for first-time offenders to fines and jail terms for repeat offenders. Although "knowingly" would undoubtedly be hard to prove, this legislation is a mandatory first step if any serious effort is to be made to address this issue. The law would have an effect analogous to that of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bans employment discrimination. As important as this statute is, it has not made it any easier to prove an act of discrimination in an individual circumstance. But the act does put the moral weight of the government on the side of antidiscrimination and, although extensive attention has been given to the act's shortcomings, it remains true that there has been an amazing degree of voluntary compliance.

A statute such as that proposed by Rodino can only strengthen efforts to ensure that immigration policy is not used as a source of cheap and rightless workers who threaten the welfare of native workers or who retard attempts to do away with low paying and exploitative jobs by supplying additional workers for these positions.

Some minority groups—especially some militant Chicano organizations—express legitimate fears that such legislation will be abused.¹⁶ The government should be able to exercise sufficient vigilance to ensure that such distortions of legislative purpose do not occur.

During both the 92nd and 93rd Congress the Rodino bill died before consideration by the Senate. The chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and of its subcommittee which was to consider the Rodino bill, Senator James Eastland (D-Mississippi), refused to convene a subcommittee meeting to discuss the bill. Representative Leo J. Ryan (D-California), a strong supporter of the Rodino bill, has pointed out:

Members of the Senate represent a constituency which has a vested

interest in no changes. The agriculture economy is based on the use of illegal aliens at a fairly low wage.¹⁷

Biaggi Bill

In addition to the Rodino bill, a bill even more severe in its enforcement provisions was introduced in the House of Representatives in January 1975. Proposed by Representative Mario Biaggi (D-New York), the bill would require that every would-be employee provide a statement that he is a citizen of the United States. Moreover, each employer would be required to affirm that he had personally examined a birth certificate or some other document proving citizenship before the employee was hired. Employers who violated the terms of the proposed bill would be subject to fines and imprisonment more severe than those in the Rodino bill. Biaggi's proposal also calls for a significant increase in the personnel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Kennedy Bill

In the Senate still another proposal has been made. This bill, originally submitted by Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Massachusetts) in 1974, contains more severe civil penalties for employers who hire illegal aliens than do the House bills, but it contains no criminal penalties (i.e., jail terms), unlike the House proposals. Moreover, the Kennedy bill would extend a virtual amnesty to all illegal aliens currently in the country who have been here for at least three years.

The latter aspect of the Kennedy proposal has gained much support from religious and community organizations. It has been strongly opposed, however, by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which feels that an offer of amnesty could only lead to additional offers in the future. Hence the Service feels that the legislation would backfire by actually promoting alien migration over the long run.

Enforcing Border Policies

As for the illegal aliens themselves, only an unimportant technicality in the law makes it a punishable offense to seek employment in the United States. In reality over 95 percent of those aliens who are apprehended are simply returned to Mexico by the most expedient form of transportation. Less than 5 percent of the illegal Mexican aliens are subjected to formal deportation proceedings that would render any subsequent entry a felony.¹⁸

The prevailing legal charade took an even more incredible twist in 1974. The commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Leonard F. Chapman, issued an order that illegal aliens apprehended outside of the actual border area would no longer be detained or returned to their homelands.¹⁹ The only exception would be those situations in which an alien was apprehended in connection with the commission of a crime. Furthermore, investigations of charges of the presence of illegal aliens would not be made unless the individual case involved at least fifty aliens.

The commissioner justified this action by pointing to the chronic shortage of funds and of manpower. Of the scant 1,600 persons in the Border Patrol in late 1974, 1,350 were assigned to the 1,800 mile Mexican border.²⁰

In addition to sanctions against employers, there is a vital need for increases in the manpower and the budget of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to a level commensurate with the scale of its responsibilities. The increases should not only affect patrolling and apprehending duties but also the conducting of hearings and prosecutions. The use of the "voluntary departure system" should be actively discouraged. Records and identification of all arrestees should be made. Jail terms should be imposed on repeat offenders. In these ways a posture of deterrence rather than acquiescence could be assumed. At the same time a concerted apprehension drive should be initiated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the cities in which illegal aliens are known to reside, to apprehend them and return them to their native land. All appropriate civil liberty protections should be applied to ensure that no false arrest or mistaken deportation occurs. But the message should be made clear: illegal alien workers from any country are unwanted guests. Concurrently with these efforts, other loopholes in the existing immigration policies which tolerate daily and seasonal commuter workers from Mexico should also be corrected.²¹

Aiding Mexico

Finally, but of extreme importance, the United States should offer to assist Mexico in developing the economy of its northern states. Financial and technical aid should be made available. Mexico, however, should design the regional plan and set its own priorities. If the government of Mexico decides that it wants no part of such aid, then so be it. But it should be made clear that a continuation of the existing unregulated exodus of its citizens into the United States is out of the question.

Prospects for a Solution

Obviously this issue does not lend itself to any easy solution. Unless coupled with a massive foreign aid program by the United States to develop the economy of northern Mexico, the prospect is that hundreds of thousands of human beings are going to suffer no matter what is done. Without U.S. assistance the more restrictive border policies proposed would condemn most of the would-be illegal Mexican aliens to lives of squalor. On the other hand, if the prevailing situation is allowed to continue, the illegal Mexican aliens and the thousands of U.S. workers (mostly Chicanos at present) with whom they compete will continue to work in a generally surplus labor market at jobs that provide no more than a bare level of existence. Numerous humane policy alternatives are available to assist immigrant workers where excess demand for labor causes migration. Few humane alternatives are available when a labor surplus exists, as in the Southwest today. All that can be done is to attempt to reduce the inflow.

The sooner the nation recognizes what policies are needed, the easier will be the eventual adjustment for all concerned. The longer it postpones the inevitable, the harder the task will be. The question is not *whether* the nation should act, but rather *when* it will act and *in what manner*.

NOTES

¹Address by William B. Saxbe, Attorney General of the United States, before the Cameron and Hidalgo County Bar Associations, October 30, 1974, Brownsville, Texas, p. 2 (mimeographed).

²Lou Wortham, "Illegal Aliens Hurt Economy," *Houston Post*, March 13, 1975.

³*Diaz v. Kay-Dix Ranch* (1970, as reprinted in House of Representatives Hearings on *Illegal Aliens*, pt. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 21, 1971), p. 179.

⁴Statement by Senator Walter F. Mondale, chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in *Hearings on Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Powerlessness*, pt. 7-B, "Manpower and Economic Problems" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 4548.

⁵David S. North and William G. Weissert, *Immigrants and the American Labor Market*, research report to the U.S. Department of Labor under contract number 20-11-73-01 (Washington, D.C.: Trans Century Corporation, 1973), pp. 47-48.

⁶"560 Aliens in Houston Deported," *Austin American-Statesman*, March 27, 1975.

⁷Dawn O'Neal, "Alien in a Strange Land," *Pearl 3* (March 1975): 24.

⁸Kelly Sayre, district director of the Texas Employment Commission for the Dallas area, quoted in "Rising Flood of Illegal Aliens," *U.S. News and World Report*, February 3, 1975, p. 30.

⁹Fred H. Schmidt, *Spanish Surnamed American Employment in the Southwest* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 50.

¹⁰Laura A. Kierman, "5 Deported Aliens Sue for Md. Wages," *Washington Post*, September 23, 1974.

¹¹Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., *Chicanos and Rural Poverty* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1973), chapter 4.

¹²*Ibid.*, pp. 42-44.

¹³Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., *The Mexico-United States Border: Public Policy and Chicano Economic Welfare*, Studies in Human Resource Development no. 2 (Austin, Texas: Center for the Study of Human Resources and Bureau of Business Research, 1974), pp. 10-21.

¹⁴North and Weissert, *Immigrants and the American Labor Market*, pp. 178-180.

¹⁵David S. North, *Alien Workers: A Study of the Labor Certification Programs* (Washington, D.C.: Trans Century Corporation, 1971), pp. 95-96.

¹⁶See Briggs, *Mexico-United States Border*, pp. 11-12.

¹⁷"Illegal Aliens Earn \$10 Billion a Year, Investigator Says," *New York Times*, December 11, 1974.

¹⁸U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee no. 1, *Hearings on Illegal Aliens*, pt. 5 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 22, 1972), p. 1315.

¹⁹Margaret Gentry, "U.S. Curbs Pursuit of Illegal Aliens," *Washington Post*, October 24, 1974; statement by Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, address for Citizenship Day Program, September 17, 1974, Chicago, Illinois (mimeographed).

²⁰Address by William B. Saxbe, Attorney General of the United States, before the Cameron and Hidalgo County Bar Associations, October 30, 1974, Brownsville, Texas, p. 8 (mimeographed).

²¹Briggs, *Mexico-United States Border*, pp. 15-21.